DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 152 387 JC 780 216

TITLE Professional Review Program for Faculty.
INSTITUTION Triton Coll., River Grove, Ill.
PUB DATE [78]
NOTE 22p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Evaluation Methods; *Faculty Development; *Faculty Evaluation; Guidelines; *Junior Colleges; *Measurement Instruments; Observation; Peer Evaluation; Questionnaires; Rating Scales; Self Evaluation; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance

ABSTRACT

The faculty review program at Triton College fulfills responsibilities to accrediting and/or approving agencies while helping to maintain teaching effectiveness and to promote instructional improvement. The professional review consists of a comprehensive assessment of the instructor's total job performance as indicated through student, peer, department chairperson/coordinator, administrator, and self-evaluations. Data generated by the evaluation process are used to provide the basis for individualized instructor professional development plans designed jointly by instructors, chairpersons, and deans after review and discussion of the assessment component results. Eligible faculty (all tenured faculty but those in their first year of tenure) are randomly drawn for evaluation in the first, second, and third years of the program, and are reviewed every three years thereafter. Evaluations include a self-assessment report, a student questionnaire, peer evaluation in a mutually determined format, and classroom observations by chairperson and administrator. The purpose and procedures for each type of evaluation and evaluation instruments or report forms for each are included in the document. (TR)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED152387

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Triton College

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# PROFESSIONAL REVIEW PROGRAM FOR FACULTY

## TRITON COLLEGE

TRITON COLLEGE
2000 FIFTH AVE.
RIVER GROVE, ILL. 60171

JC 780 216

This proposal is the result of the efforts of many individuals. Appreciation is expressed to each:

AD HOC EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Carol Casten
James Given
James Hurley
Otto Kolar
James Lemkuil
Maurice Lemoine
Vernon Magnesen
Jerry Owens
John Reibsamen
Clyde LeTarte, ex officio

CAREER EDUCATION EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Alec Beaudoin
Tom Bondi
Linda Breuer
Margaret Budz
Carol Casten
Clara Chann
Ralph Domabil
Leo Flynn
James Given
Nick Jason
Ina Latimer
James Lemkuil
Maurice Lemoine
Robert Link
Vernon Magnesen
Ray Oviyach
Mary Ann Peel
Sharon Pieroni
Virginia Reisner
Loretta Rocks
Chuck Vilim
Donna Weaver
Robert Witherspoon
Lon Yeary

UNIVERSITY TRANSFER STUDIES EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Russ Anderson
Anthony Armagno
Carole Bauer
James Bondi
Dan Bourbulas
John Boyle
Clyde Chisum
Lallie Coy
Thomas Crum
Francis DeGrado
Gerald Droszcz
Donald Giersch
Barbara Haxby
Donald Hazen
Douglas Johnson
Raymond McNamee
Jerry Owens
C. K. Patel
Mary Ann Rosati
Eugene Schlabach
Laurence Smith
Richard Steele
Norman Wiegel

# OVERVIEW OF PROGRAM AND PROCEDURES

## INTRODUCTION

Effective teaching is a professional responsibility of every Triton College instructor and periodic review is essential for maintaining a high level of teaching effectiveness. The purpose of the professional review process is primarily formative; that is, designed to maintain teaching effectiveness and to promote instructional improvement. Furthermore, the review process fulfills responsibilities to accrediting and/or approving agencies.

## PROGRAM COMPONENTS

The professional review will consist of a comprehensive evaluation of the instructor's total job performance. It will consist of the following:

1. Instructor Self-Evaluation
2. Student Evaluation
3. Peer Evaluation
4. Department Chairperson/Coordinator Evaluation
5. Administrator Evaluation

The comprehensive nature of the evaluation program is based on the belief that several components used together, each of which examines a different aspect of teaching or views the teaching/learning process from a different perspective, is preferable to the use of any single component.

The purpose and procedure for each of these components is described in greater detail below.

## THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The data that is produced by the evaluation process will provide the basis for an individualized professional development plan for the instructor. The professional development plan will be designed jointly by the instructor, chairperson, and dean after they review and discuss the input received from the five program components.

## THE SELECTION PROCEDURE

The procedure for selecting the faculty to be evaluated each year is as follows:

1. The pool of eligibles consists of all tenured faculty but does not include those who are in their first tenure year.

2. Using a table of random numbers, one-third of the pool of eligibles* from the School of Career Education and one-third from the School of University Transfer Studies will be selected for professional review to occur during the first year of the program and every third year thereafter; the second one-third will be selected for the second year of the program and every third year thereafter, and, the remaining one-third will be selected for the third year of the program and every third year thereafter.

3. The selection will be conducted by the Faculty Association President or his designee and the Vice President for Academic Affairs or his designee.

4. Each year the faculty who become eligible for professional review will be assigned to a three-year review cycle by the method of random selection described in (2) above.

---

* A system for the review of librarians and counselors will also be developed, which will include parallel selection procedures.

## INSTRUMENTATION

The following pages are divided into two sections. The first section provides some of the rationale and committee thinking related to each of the five major components established for professional review.

The second section provides the specific review instruments as suggested by the Ad hoc Committee

# SECTION I

## REVIEW OF MAJOR COMPONENTS

## SCHOOL OF UNIVERSITY TRANSFER STUDIES

STUDENT EVALUATION

The student is the only person who will experience the full semester of classroom instruction and thus is in a unique position to comment on a variety of factors which relate to the quality of instruction.

PROCEDURE

1. The Perceptions of Teaching form will be administered to each of the instructor's classes during the fall semester of the evaluation year between mid-semester and the end of the semester according to the procedure established by each department. Faculty may wish to submit additional student evaluations from other semesters and this is encouraged.
2. The completed evaluation forms will be delivered to the Computer Center for tabulation after all of the instructor's classes have been surveyed.
3. The instructor, the chairperson, and the dean will receive a copy of the summary report.
4.* The student evaluation report will indicate the frequency of response for each point on the six-point scale (See Section II - Perceptions of Teaching form) The number of students and percent of students responding will be reported.

Example: (assuming a class of 30 students)

1. The instructor is well prepared for classes.

| Not At All Descriptive | | | | | Very Descriptive |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 1 (3%) | 1 (3%) | 3 (10%) | 5 (17%) | 8 (27%) | 12 (40%) |

---

* The Ad hoc Committee received a recommendation from the UTS Committee to combine ratings into a descriptive/not descriptive structure. This was rejected by the Ad hoc Committee because it is necessary to know the degree of feeling regarding strengths and weaknesses to adequately plan for professional development activities and to know which areas are major strengths. Because the Ad hoc Committee did not concur with UTS, however, it was believed important to share the proposal submitted:

Student Evaluation Report Format Recommended by UTS Committee

The evaluation data will be reported as follows: For each item on the questionnaire, if the mean score is 4 or higher on the six-point scale, the report will indicate that the item is "descriptive" of the instructor; if the mean score is less than 4, the actual score will be reported with the indication that the item is "not descriptive" of the instructor.

Example:

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Item #1 | Descriptive | | Item #3 | Descriptive | |
| Item #2 | | Not Descriptive 3.5 | Item #4 | | Not Descriptive 2.7 |

## INSTRUCTOR SELF EVALUATION

The self-report/evaluation instruments serve three functions:

1. An opportunity to present the breadth of professional development activities in which the instructor has been engaged;

2. An opportunity to report the impact these activities have had on instruction;

3. An opportunity to suggest areas for future professional growth.

### PROCEDURE

The self-evaluation report will be submitted to the dean by February 15 of the evaluation year according to the procedure that is determined by each department. (See Section II - Self Evaluation form)

It is recommended that the report be completed on an annual basis and summarized during the evaluation year.

## PEER EVALUATION

There are several important aspects of teaching where collegial input would appear especially valuable: Among these are:

1. The instructor's current knowledge of a subject.

2. The course syllabus and objectives.

3. The reading lists and materials used in instruction, (including equipment).

4. The assignments and examinations.

5. Concrete evidence of student achievement in a course such as term papers, lab projects, etc.

These aspects could be assessed by colleagues within the same discipline and without necessarily evaluating classroom instruction. In some instances class visits can be especially worthwhile when followed by a post-conference. Peer evaluation has particular utility when it is part of a comprehensive system of evaluation.

### PROCEDURE

Peer evaluations, including all reports, will be completed during the fall semester of the evaluation year. (See Section II - Peer Evaluation form)

Because the major emphasis of peer evaluation is course content, at least one of the peer evaluations must be from the instructor's discipline.

Specific areas to be evaluated as well as the format for peer evaluation must be mutually determined by the instructor, chairperson, and dean.

## CHAIRPERSON EVALUATION

The department chairperson, through his or her day-to-day interaction with the instructor, is in a position to evaluate such things as:

1. Overall effectiveness and performance of the instructor's teaching and non-teaching responsibilities.
2. The ability of the instructor to reach different levels and kinds of students.
3. The ability to develop effective teaching strategies.
4. The ability to contribute to the institutions effectiveness in instruction beyond the classroom.
5. Course outlines and syllabi, tests, materials, and methods employed in instruction.
6. Evidence of professional activity.

The chairperson's evaluation should also include reports of class observations. Class observation coupled with other available data will enable him or her to assess the effectiveness of instruction.

PROCEDURE

1. The department chairperson will observe at least one class during the fall semester of the evaluation year.

2. The chairperson will submit a written report to the instructor within one week of the class visit. The report will be signed by the instructor and returned to the chairperson who will submit it to the dean. (See Section II - Chairperson Evaluation form)

3. At the request of either the instructor or the chairperson, a post-visit conference will be held.

## ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION

The dean or other appropriate administrator is in a position to make overall observations of a variety of factors which have an impact on the quality of instruction. The major role of the administrator in the evaluation process is: (1) To visit the instructor's class to observe the instructional process, (2) To review the type of planning, type of presentation, degree of student participation, and overall effectiveness; (3) To compare the objectives perceived by the administrator with those of the instructor; and (4) Upon completion of this review, and after receiving other data collected, the administrator will work with the department chairperson and the instructor in developing an individualized professional development plan for the instructor. The professional development plan should be realistic and achievable, and it should include both short- and long-term activities.

PROCEDURE

1. The administrator will observe at least one class during the fall semester of the evaluation year.

2. The administrator will submit a written report to the instructor within one week of the class visit. The report will be signed by the instructor and submitted to the dean. (See Section II - Classroom Visit Report form)

3. At the request of either the instructor or the dean a post-visit conference will be held.

# SECTION II

# REVIEW INSTRUMENTS

# SCHOOL OF UNIVERSITY TRANSFER STUDIES

SCHOOL OF UNIVERSITY TRANSFER STUDIES
PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHING

For each of the statements mark the space in the answer sheet which indicates the degree to which you feel each item is descriptive of the instructor.

| NOT AT ALL DESCRIPTIVE | | | | | VERY DESCRIPTIVE | DOES NOT APPLY OR DON'T KNOW |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | X |

1. The instructor is well prepared for classes. ☐
2. The instructor establishes a sincere interest in subject being taught. ☐
3. The instructor demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of his/her subject. ☐
4. The instructor clearly states the objectives of the course. ☐
5. The instructor told students how they would be evaluated. ☐
6. The instructor communicates effectively at the level which is appropriate to the background of students. ☐
7. The instructor starts and ends class on time. ☐
8. The instructor encourages student participation and interaction. ☐
9. The instructor organizes the course so that the relationships among the various topics and class activities are clear. ☐
10. The instructor treats students with respect. ☐
11. The instructor acknowledges and responds to students' questions. ☐
12. How do you rate this instructor? ☐

* * *

(Choose one of the following)

1. Below average--considerable improvement is needed.
2. Average--improvement is needed.
3. Good instructor--is effective most of the time.
4. Very effective--much learning occurs.

General comments:

SCHOOL OF UNIVERSITY TRANSFER STUDIES
SELF EVALUATION

NAME_____ DATE_____

Please describe your accomplishments in your role as a Triton College instructor. Attach any illustrative materials or evidence of accomplishment you feel is appropriate. Some specific areas for consideration are:

1. Participation in workshops, seminars;
2. Professional reading;
3. Attendance at conferences/conventions/professional meetings;
4. Off-campus visitations;
5. Membership in professional organizations;
6. Formal study;
7. Independent study/research;
8. Professional writing;
9. Research and Developmental projects;
10. Summer employment in teaching field or related area;
11. Special GPU project;
12. Other (any areas the instructor feels appropriate)

(You are not expected to have been actively involved in all of these areas.)

(Attach additional pages as needed)

SCHOOL OF UNIVERSITY TRANSFER STUDIES
PEER EVALUATION

Instructor: _____

Department: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

Discipline: _____

I. Relevant areas for consideration:

A. Course structure

1. definition of course
2. objectives and/or goals
3. course outline
4. future directions of course

B. Classroom or Laboratory Management

1. preparation
2. presentation of materials (printed, visual, oral)
3. methodology or techniques
4. record keeping
5. student/instructor interactions

C. Use of conference hours and/or departmental activities

D. Other

II. A. Areas of Excellence

B. Areas For Possible Development

C. Suggestions For Development

III. Instructor's Response to Evaluation

Evaluator's Signature _____

Instructor's Signature _____

SCHOOL OF UNIVERSITY TRANSFER STUDIES
CHAIRPERSON EVALUATION FORM

Instructor_____ Chairperson_____

Department_____ Date_____

Assumptions:

1. The overall purpose of this "evaluation" is to help improve instruction. This would be accomplished by helping the instructor become:

   a. a more effective teacher,
   b. a more effective member of his/her department, and
   c. a more effective member of the Triton College community.

2. The above categories are not equally weighted.

3. Working toward improvement in any area does not necessarily indicate deficiency in that area.

4. Instruction takes place in areas outside of the classroom as well as in the classroom.

(If the instructor meets expectations, no comment is necessary.)

I. TOWARD A MORE EFFECTIVE TEACHER:

A. Exhibits effective classroom management through the following:

1. Preparedness

meets expectations_____

Comments:

2. Teaching skills (lecturing, discussion leading, etc.)

meets expectations_____

Comments:

3. Student/Teacher relationships

meets expectations_____

Comments:

B. Participates in course development

meets expectations_____

Comments:

C. Recognizes and adjusts teaching to different levels of student achievement in class

meets expectations_____

Comments:

D. Regularly reevaluates and/or revises course syllabi

meets expectations_____

Comments:

E. Posts and meets office hours

meets expectations_____

Comments:

II. TOWARD A MORE EFFECTIVE MEMBER OF THE DEPARTMENT

A. Participates and cooperates with members of the department

meets expectations_____

Comments:

B. Carries out departmental responsibilities

meets expectations_____

Comments:

C. Attends department meetings

meets expectations_____

Comments:

D. Meets deadlines (completion of forms relating to department business)

meets expectations_____

Comments:

III. TOWARD A MORE EFFECTIVE MEMBER OF THE COLLEGE (COLLEGE SERVICE)

A. Works with students

Comments

B. Works in college activities

Comments:

C. Other (in-service development, trips, professional activities.)

Comments:

IV. SUMMARY EVALUATION

Comments:

| Department Chairperson | Date | Instructor | Date |
|---|---|---|---|

Instructor Comments:

SCHOOL OF UNIVERSITY TRANSFER STUDIES
CLASSROOM VISIT REPORT FORM

Instructor _____ Date _____

Class _____ Time _____

Topic of Lesson _____

1. Preparation (objectives, evidence of planning, etc.)

2. Explanation (instructional techniques, organization, supplementary materials, visual aids, etc.)

3. Student Response (listening, notetaking, participation etc.)

4. General Comments

_____
Administrator

CONFERENCE WITH ADMINISTRATOR
(May Be Requested by Administrator or Instructor)

Summary of Evaluation:

Instructor's Comments:

Administrator _____ Date _____

Instructor _____ Date _____

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAY 26 1978

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES